03/13/2006 15:23 FAX 17349946331

BRINKS, HOFER, ET AL

2007

Appl. No. 10/087,691

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1904

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above

amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 2-7 and 21-26 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner's indication, during the March 7, 2005 telephone conference,

that claims 2-7 are allowed is gratefully acknowledged.

Further Claim Clarifications

Prior to discussing the references, it is believed that a brief discussion on the

current form of claim 21 of this application is warranted. Claim 21 of this application

has been amended to clarify, more particularly to point out and distinctly claim that

which applicant regards as the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically,

the claim 21 now recites that the digital signal processor (DSP) is configured to

retrieve one of said addresses by use of a first pointer to execute a firs: equalization

structure, retrieve a corresponding set of filter coefficients by use of a second pointer

to provide the first equalization structure, apply a set of filter coefficients to said

equalization structure, filter said input signal utilizing said equalization structure and

produce an intermediate result wherein said intermediate result is stored for

additional filtering.

BRINKS HOFER GILSON BLIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610-5599 - 6 -

03/13/2006 15:23 FAX 17349946331

BRINKS, HOFER, ET AL

Ø 008

Appl. No. 10/087,691

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1904

Claim Objections

Claim 1 and 21 were objected to because of informalities. Claim 1 has been

cancelled, rendering the objection moot. Claim 21 was objected to because of the

phrases "having DSP memory unit" and "the controller configured to transferring."

As suggested by the examiner, these phrases have been replaced with the phrases

"having a DSP memory unit" and "the controller configured to transfer", respectively.

Additionally, the examiner indicated that the phrase "said intermediate results" is

unclear. Accordingly, Claim 21 has been amended to replace the phrase "said

intermediate results" with the phrase "said intermediate result." It is believed that

these objections are now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Milne in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,428 to Allred ("Allred").

Claim 1 has been cancelled rendering the rejection moot. As to claim 21, applicant

respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 21 has been amended to recite that the digital signal processor (DSP)

is configured to retrieve one of said addresses by use of a first pointer to execute a

first equalization structure, retrieve a corresponding set of filter coefficients by use of

a second pointer to provide the first equalization structure, apply a set of filter

coefficients to said equalization structure, filter said input signal utilizing said

equalization structure and produce an intermediate result wherein said intermediate

result is stored for additional filtering.

BRINKS HOFEA GILSON ELIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610-5599

-7-

- '03/13/2006 15:23 FAX 17349946331

BRINKS, HOFER, ET AL

21009

Appl. No. 10/087,691

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1904

Neither of the references, separately or in combination, teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 21. More specifically, the references neither teach nor suggest a DSP configured to utilize a first pointer to retrieve an address from a sequence of addresses to execute an equalization and utilize a second pointer to retrieve a corresponding set of filter coefficients. In that the references fail to disclose or suggest these features, it must be concluded that the combination of Milne in view of Allred cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 22-26, these claims are dependent on claim 21 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as those given above in support of claim 21. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectively requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

March 13, 2006

Date

John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57 414)

BRINKS HOFER CILSON &LIONE BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610-5599